REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1, 7-10, and 21-25 are pending in the application. In the Office Action December 23, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 7-10, and 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite and rejected claims 1, 7-10, and 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0116473 ("Gemmell") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,496,980 ("Tillman"), U.S. Pat. No. 5,790,935 ("Payton") and U.S. Pat. No. 6,392,705 ("Chadda"). In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 21, and 25.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that claims 1, 21, and 25 are indefinite because the disclosure requires that that video content is first compressed and then decomposed. Applicants respectfully disagree that the disclosure requires that video content is first compressed and then decomposed, and note that at least paragraph [0025] of the present application states that content files are decomposed using compression techniques. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 25 to generally recite decomposing video content into a plurality of video quality portions during compression of the video content and amended independent claim 21 to generally recite means for decomposing compressed video content into a plurality of parts during compression of video content. Applicants request reconsideration in light of the amendments to the claims.

III. The Proposed Combinations Do Not Render the Claims Unpatentable

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 25 to generally recite decomposing video content into a plurality of video quality portions during compression of the video content, wherein the compression of the video content uses one of a sub-band technique or a vector quantization technique, wherein a low-quality video portion of the plurality of video quality portions comprises a complete copy of the program at a video quality lower than at least one of the plurality of video quality portions, and wherein each video

quality portion of the plurality of video quality portions other than the low-quality video portion is optimized for a different bandwidth. Similarly, Applicants have amended claim 21 to generally recite means for decomposing compressed video content into a plurality of parts during compression of the video content, wherein the compression of the video content uses one of a sub-band technique or a vector quantization technique, wherein each of the parts containing data representing a predetermined level of video quality, and wherein each part of the plurality of parts is optimized for a different bandwidth. The Examiner has not previously asserted that the proposed combinations of Gemmell, Tillman, Payton, and Chadda teach these elements. Applicants request reconsideration in light of the Amendments to the claims.

IV.   Conclusion

Applicants request reconsideration in light of the amendments to the claims. If there are any questions concerning this Amendment, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

<div align="right">

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott W. Brim/
Scott W. Brim
Registration No. 51,500
Attorney for Applicants

</div>

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200